UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,179	01/15/2002	Kenneth L. Stanwood	112174-010UTL	2846

27189 7590 08/26/2010

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP
525 B STREET
SUITE 2200
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER	
SEFCHECK, GREGORY B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2477	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@procopio.com
PTONotifications@procopio.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/053,179	STANWOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GREGORY B. SEFCHECK	2477	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 July 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *51-75 and 82-98* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *51-75 and 82-98* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- Applicant's Amendment filed 7/26/2010 is acknowledged.
- Claims 1-50 and 76-81 have been previously cancelled.
- Claims 51, 63, 83, and 89 have been amended.
- Claims 97 and 98 have been added.
- Claims 51-75 and 82-98 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 51-55, 63-67, 75, 82-90, 97, and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kordsmeyer et al. (US006963751B1), hereafter Kordsmeyer, in view of Van Grinsven et al. (US20010015985A1), hereafter Van Grinsven.

- Regarding claims 51, 63, 75, 84, 89, and 98,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system in which service data units (SDU) are packed and fragmented into protocol data units (PDU) having an ELT (header) and DAF (payload; Abstract; Background; Fig. 1-2; claim 51,63,89 – node/base station/method in a communications system, that packs and

fragments service data units over a communications link as a protocol data unit having a payload area and a header area; claim 51,63,89 – pack and fragment service data units into payload of protocol data units; claim 51,63,89 – means for mapping a first service data unit to the payload area of a protocol data unit).

Kordsmeyer discloses SDU4 and a fragment FR3 of SDU5 is stored in the payload of PDU5, along with INFs (subheaders) specifying the length of the SDUs in the DAF of the PDU in order to fully utilize the DAF of each PDU, with corresponding INFs to indicate the fragmentation state of the DAF - the first/continuing/end fragment and length of each SDU (Fig. 2; Col. 8-9, lines 47-23; claim 51,63,89 - wherein the payload area of the protocol data unit comprises a corresponding packing subheader specifying the length of each packed service data unit; claim 51,63,89 – means for determining whether a second service data unit is larger than the remaining payload area of the protocol data unit; claim 51,63,89 - if the second service data unit is not larger than the remaining payload area of the protocol data unit, then means for mapping the second service data unit to the remaining payload area of the protocol data unit; claim 51,63,89 - if the second service data unit is larger than the remaining payload area of the protocol data unit, then means for fragmenting the second service data unit into at least two fragments and means for mapping the first fragment to the payload area of the protocol data unit; claim 89 - subheader fragmentation control field indicating whether the corresponding service data unit is a first fragment, a continuing fragment, a last fragment or an unfragmented service data unit).

Kordsmeyer discloses SDUs and PDUs are associated with a specific user connection/session (corresponding ELT of each PDU; Col. 1, lines 20-65; claim 51,63,89 – PDU and SDU associated with a specific user connection; claim 75 - header area of protocol data unit comprises a connection identifier field).

Kordsmeyer discloses fixed length PDUs. Thus, Kordsmeyer does not explicitly disclose establishing the length of a variable length PDU in conjunction with the bandwidth allocated to the connection, or indicating such length in the header of the PDU.

Van Grinsven discloses a transmission system with a flexible frame structure (Title) in which packing and fragmenting of SDUs into variable length PDUs. Van Grinsven discloses that the length of the PDU may be dynamically varied on a frame-by-frame basis based upon the size of the current packet and data format of the particular SDU to be transmitted (Fig. 4; paragraphs 6, 7, 41, 42, 55; claim 51,63,89 – length of PDU is established in conjunction with the bandwidth allocated to the specified connection in a current frame based on one or more communication parameters associated with the connection and general system parameters).

Van Grinsven shows that the size of each respective PDU is included in the header of the PDU (4 bit "size" field; paragraph 41; claim 51,63,89 - wherein the header area of the protocol data unit comprises a length field).

Van Grinsven shows that the amount of bandwidth for sending the variable-length PDUs may be shared amoung data of various formats (paragraph 7; claim 98 – one or more communication parameters include an amount of bandwidth requested for the connection and an amount of bandwidth to be shared in the frame with other connections established at the node).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kordsmeyer by packing and fragmentation of SDUs into variable-length PDUs, based upon the bandwidth utilized for each specific connection, as shown by Van Grinsven, while specifying the PDU length in the header, thereby enabling adaptation and optimization of connection bandwidth of different protocols having different PDU requirements.

- Regarding claims 52 and 64,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system meeting all limitations of the parent claims.

Kordsmeyer discloses transmission of the PDUs as messages (frames) over a wireless connection (Col. 1, lines 20-60; claim 52,64 - transmitter to map the protocol data units into frames and transmit the frames).

- Regarding claims 53 and 65,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system meeting all limitations of the parent claims.

Kordsmeyer discloses SDUs of various service data - voice and/or packet data (Col. 1, lines 60-65; claim 53,65 – service data units have more than one format).

- Regarding claims 54, 55, 66, 67, 82, and 90,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system meeting all limitations of the parent claims.

Kordsmeyer discloses INFs (subheaders) specifying the length of each SDU or fragment thereof in the DAF of each PDU in order to fully utilize the DAF of each PDU, with corresponding INFs to indicate the fragmentation state of the DAF as the first/continuing/end fragment and length of each SDU (Fig. 2; Col. 8-9, lines 47-23; claim 54,66 - packing subheader further comprises a fragmentation control field specifying whether the protocol data unit includes a service data unit fragment; claim 82 - first SDU is a last fragment of a SDU).

Kordsmeyer shows the INFs may include information items IN1-IN3, whereas IN1-IN3 indicates whether the DAF of the PDU includes at least a fragment of more than one SDU (claim 55,67 - fragmentation control field comprises at least two bits).

Kordsmeyer shows that the INF does not necessarily include each of IN1-IN3, making the INF variable in length (Col. 3, lines 10-46; claim 90 – length of packing subheaders is variable).

- Regarding claims 83 and 84,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method in a wireless communication system in which service data units (SDU) are packed and fragmented into protocol data units (PDU) having a header and data field (payload), the SDUs and PDUs associated with a specific user connection (ELT of each PDU; Col. 1, lines 20-65; Abstract; Background; Fig. 1-2; claim 83 – method of formatting protocol data units (PDUs) from incoming service data units (SDUs) for transmission of data carried by the FDUs over a communication channel shared by one or more user connections).

Kordsmeyer discloses PDUs include an ELT (header) and DAF (payload) based upon the varied services provided over the bandwidth of wireless connections between data sources and data sinks according to a particular protocol (Fig. 2; Col. 1, lines 20-65; claim 83 - provisioning a protocol data unit (PDU), including a header and a payload area).

Kordsmeyer discloses SDU4 and a fragment FR3 of SDU5 is stored in the payload of PDU5, along with INFs (subheaders) specifying the length of the SDUs in the DAF of the PDU in order to fully utilize the DAF of each PDU, with corresponding INFs to indicate the fragmentation state of the DAF - the first/continuing/end fragment and length of each SDU (Fig. 2; Col. 8-9, lines 47-23; claim 83 - packing and fragmenting the SDUs associated with the user connection into the payload area of the PDU based on the length of the payload area).

Kordsmeyer does not explicitly disclose a variable length PDU, the length established in conjunction with the bandwidth allocated currently to the user connection and changing as the allocated bandwidth changes.

Van Grinsven discloses a transmission system with a flexible frame structure (Title) in which packing and fragmenting of SDUs into variable length PDUs. Van Grinsven discloses that the length of the PDU may be dynamically varied on a frame-by-frame basis based upon the size of the current packet and data format of the particular SDU to be transmitted (Fig. 4; paragraphs 6, 7, 41, 42, 55; claim 83 – length of PDU is established in conjunction with the bandwidth allocated to the specified connection in a current frame based on one or more communication parameters associated with the connection and general system parameters; claim 84 – length of PDU changes as the bandwidth allocated to the specified connection changes).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kordsmeyer by packing and fragmentation of SDUs into variable-length PDUs based upon the packet size (bandwidth) required for a connection, as shown by Van Grinsven, thereby enabling adaptation and optimization of connection bandwidth of different protocols having different PDU requirements.

- Regarding claims 85-88,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system meeting all limitations of the parent claims.

Kordsmeyer discloses how subsequent SDUs are packed and fragmented into PDUs in order to fully utilize the DAF of each PDU, with corresponding INFs to indicate the fragmentation state of the DAF - the first/continuing/end fragment and length of each SDU (Fig. 2; Col. 8-9, lines 60-2; claim 85 - mapping one or more SDUs into the payload area of the PDU until a remaining area in the payload area of the PDU cannot accommodate a next SDU; claim 85 - fragmenting the next SDU into a first and a second fragment, the first fragment having the length of the remaining area; claim 85 - mapping the first fragment to the remaining area; claim 85 - inserting fragmentation header information to indicate the fragmentation state of the payload and to identify the first fragment as being a first fragment; claim 86 - any SDU fragment includes a fragmentation control field identifying the SDU fragment; claim 87 - mapping the second fragment to a next PDU if the length of the second fragment fits into the length of the payload area of the next PDU; claim 87 - inserting fragmentation control information to indicate the fragmentation state of the payload and to identify the last fragment as being a last fragment; claim 88 - further fragmenting the second fragment if the length of the second fragment is larger than the length of the payload area of a next PDU to obtain a third fragment having the length of the payload area of the next PDU; claim 88 - mapping the third fragment to the next PDU; claim 88 - inserting fragmentation control information, to indicate the fragmentation state of the payload and to identify the third fragment).

- Regarding claim 97,

Kordsmeyer shows PDU3 includes only the first fragment of SDU3 in its data field because SDU3 is larger than the data field of PDU3 (Fig. ; Col. 4, lines 53-55; claim 97 – if the first service data unit is larger than the payload area of the protocol data unit, fragmenting the first service data unit to obtain a fragment of the size of the payload area of the protocol data unit and mapping the fragment to the protocol data unit).

3. Claims 56 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kordsmeyer in view of Van Grinsven as applied to claims 51 and 63 above, and further in view of Sengodan et al. (US006918034B1), hereafter Sengodan.

- Regarding claims 56 and 68,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system meeting all limitations of the parent claims.

Kordsmeyer discloses transmission of SDU fragments in sequential PDUs, but does not explicitly disclose a fragment sequence number in the packing subheader.

Sengodan discloses transferring mobile telephony service data using IP protocol packets (Fig. 1, 3; Col. 1, lines 15-17, 40-52; Col. 3, lines 22-43). Sengodan discloses mapping mini-packets MPs into the payload of a single RTP/UDP/IP packet, where each MP has a corresponding mini-header that includes a length indicator LI of the MP and 2 bit sequence number for marking the order of mini-packets within the IP packet(s)

from a single user (claim 56,68 - packing subheader further comprises a fragment sequence number).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a fragment sequence number in the packing subheader of Kordsmeyer, as shown by Sengodan, thereby ensuring proper reception and decoding of the service data in a system in which sequential transmission and reception of service data is not guaranteed.

4. Claims 57-62 and 69-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kordsmeyer in view of Van Grinsven as applied to claims 51 and 63 above, and further in view of Caronni et al. (US006970941B1), hereafter Caronni.

- Regarding claims 57-62 and 68-74,

Kordsmeyer discloses a method and wireless communication system meeting all limitations of the parent claims.

Kordsmeyer discloses the use of encryption, but does not explicitly disclose an encryption control/key field in the header of the PDU comprising at least two bits. Kordsmeyer also shows how IN1-IN3 indicates whether the DAF of the PDU includes at least a fragment of more than one SDU, but does not explicitly disclose a subheader present field in the PDU header.

Referring to Fig. 6, Caronni discloses a system and method in an IP network in which a supernet header 620 includes a field 624 for storing encyption key (control)

information). Caronni discloses a key for each channel (Col. 5, lines 36-38; Col. 6, lines 1-4), thereby necessitating at least two bits to represent the key in a system with more than two channels shown in Kordsmeyer and Van Grinsven (claim 59,61,71,73 - header area of the protocol data unit comprises an encryption control/key field; claim 60,62,72,74 - encryption control/key field comprises at least one/two bits).

Additionally, Caronni discloses next header fields that indicate the presence of additional headers prepended to the packet payload (claim 57,69 - wherein the header area of the protocol data unit comprises a packing subheader present field; claim 58,70 - wherein the packing subheader present field comprises at least one bit).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kordsmeyer and Van Grinsven by implementing encryption control/key fields and subheader present fields, as shown by Caronni. This would provide security and further bandwidth optimization in implementing selective fragmentation and packing of SDUs into PDUs shown by Kordsmeyer.

5. Claims 91-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kordsmeyer in view of Van Grinsven as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Hathaway et al. (US20020126677A1), hereafter Hathaway.

- Regarding claims 91-94,

Kordsmeyer discloses processing of service data of voice and data, but does not explicitly disclose classifying them based on a connection identifier using specific

control protocols, a convergence layer for establishment maintenance and transfer of the service or data queuing based on the connection identifier and individual characteristics.

Hathaway discloses a packet processing system that receives, classifies and separately queues different types of data using specific control protocols based upon connection identifier (Fig. 2-3B, 5; paragraphs 12-13; claim 91 - classification module for classifying the SDUs based on at least a connection identifier, for enabling packing and fragmenting of the SDUs on the connection in a PDU allocated to that connection; claim 92 - classification module uses control protocols specific to each particular type of SDU being classified; claim 94 - data queuing module wherein the SDUs are sorted based on the connection identifier and individual characteristics).

Hathaway further discloses convergence between CPS packets, AAL2 cells and PDUs as well as channel identifier mapping performing connection establishment, maintenance and data transfer (Fig. 6; claim 93 - convergence sublayer module that processes the SDUs classified by the classification module for service specific connection establishment, maintenance, and data transfer operations).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by modifying Kordsmeyer by enabling classifying and separately queuing different types of data using specific control protocols based upon connection identifier and convergence of the different data types for channel mapping purposes, as shown by Hathaway, thereby permitting adaptive processing of various protocol types by the same system.

6. Claims 95 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kordsmeyer in view of Van Grinsven and Hathaway as applied to claim 91 above, and further in view of Payne, III (US20060062250A1), hereafter Payne.

- Regarding claims 95 and 96,

Kordsmeyer does not explicitly disclose a bandwidth allocation map with the bandwidth allocated to each node sharing the communication channel or establishing the bandwidth allocated to each connection from the bandwidth currently allocated to a respective node based on the priority and type of the connections served by the node.

Payne discloses support for multiple frame types in which a bandwidth allocation map is defined for each subscriber unit over a shared medium, including linked priority queuing (Title; Fig. 13; paragraph 94; claim 95 - communication control module which prepares a bandwidth allocation map with the bandwidth allocated to each node sharing the communication channel; claim 96 - communications processor establishes the bandwidth allocated to each connection from the bandwidth currently allocated to a respective node based on the priority and type of the connections served by the node).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kordsmeyer by defining bandwidth allocations to subscriber units in consideration of the priority and type of data for a connection, as shown by Payne. This would permit the handling of different protocol data having different priorites, such as the voice and data disclosed by Kordsmeyer.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/26/2010 regarding the rejections in view of Van Grinsven have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the Remarks on pg. 12-13 of the Amendment, Applicant contends that Kordsmeyer is specifically designed for a system such as DECT and does not allow for processing SDUs of various data types as claimed.
- The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., processing of various data types) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, even if the claims did require the accommodation of various data types, Kordsmeyer is not directed only to a DECT system, as implied by Applicant. Rather, Kordsmeyer is relevant much more generally to "transmitting service data in telecommunications systems with wireless telecommunication based on a predefined radio interface protocol". Implementation and disclosure focused specifically on a DECT system is for illustrative purposes only and does not limit the teachings of Kordsmeyer to other relevant systems. Furthermore, cited disclosure of Van Grinsven specifically pertains to accommodating various data formats

in a unified, flexible frame structure. Therefore, the combination of Kordsmeyer and Van Grinsven would meet a limitation of accommodating data of various types, even if it were explicitly presented in the claims.

- In the Remarks on pg. 13 of the Amendment, Applicant contends that the combination of Kordsmeyer and Van Grinsven would not result in the claimed system because Kordsmeyer pertains to SDUs and PDUs at the MAC layer while Van Grinsven discloses mapping data into frames at the physical layer.
- The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Again, the respective disclosures of Kordsmeyer and Van Grinsven are not relegated to any particular protocol or layer of processing associated with such a protocol, as alleged by Applicant. The concepts of fragmentation and packing in order to improve bandwidth efficiency is common to both disclosures, therefore the combination properly rejects the present claims.

- In the Remarks on pg. 13-14 of the Remarks, Applicant contends that Van Grinsven does not disclose establishing the length of variable length PDUs based on the currently allocated bandwidth of a connection. Rather, Applicant alleges Van Grinsven determines PDU length based on the size of the incoming packet.

- As now shown in the rejection, it is agreed that Van Grinsven discloses establishing the length of a PDU based upon the size of the incoming packet. However, contrary to Applicant's view, the size of an incoming packet in Van Grinsven is maintained as being equivalent to the "bandwidth currently allocated to a connection in a current frame based one or more communication parameters", as claimed. Since each incoming packet in Van Grinsven and Kordsmeyer is associated with a connection of a corresponding data format (e.g. ATM, STM, etc.), the size and format of the incoming packet represents the current allocation of bandwidth to that connection, and thus controls the size of the PDU (i.e. Fig. 4). Since Van Grinsven shows that PDU size may change as the size and format of the data changes, the disclosure of Van Grinsven illustrates establishing the length of a variable length PDU based upon the currently allocated bandwidth in a current frame based one or more communication parameters. Modifying Kordsmeyer with this disclosure of Van Grinsven, as shown in the rejection, properly meets all of the claimed limitations. Therefore, the claim rejections are proper.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY B. SEFCHECK whose telephone number is (571)272-3098. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chirag Shah can be reached on 571-272-3144. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory B Sefcheck/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2477
8-20-2010